

Resolved, That the Shoshone Paiute Business Council will solicit the approval of the County Medical Society and the State Medical and Hospital Associations and all surrounding medical facilities.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. GRAVEL, and Mr. STEVENS):

S. 1801. A bill to authorize certain Indian hospital facilities to be made available to non-Indians under certain conditions. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize certain Indian hospital facilities to be made available to non-Indians under certain conditions.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make remote Indian medical facilities available to non-Indians under certain conditions, with the consent of the major Indian tribes served by the facility, and provided that priority is given the needs of Indian people.

The high cost of medical resources and the scarcity of professional skills have clearly delineated the need for more effective utilization of existing health centers and health manpower skills. Throughout the United States, there exist pockets of medical care deprivation, not caused by the lack of resources, but by lack of legislative authority to make existing health resources available to those in need. For example, there are approximately 600 non-Indians residing within a 50-mile radius of the Owyhee, Nev., Indian Hospital and the nearest hospital for these people is at Elko, Nev., approximately 90 miles away.

While other hospitals of the Division of Indian Health located in remote areas are made available to Federal employees and their dependents under existing law, no provision, except for emergencies, has been made for private citizens who reside in the vicinity.

There is legal precedent for extending health care in Public Health Service Indian hospitals to nonbeneficiaries. In Alaska, such care is provided pursuant to 48 United States Code 49. The State of Alaska has designated certain areas as "remote" with reference to the availability of health services, and in these areas the Public Health Service hospitals provide health services on a reimbursable basis to nonbeneficiaries.

The present proposal will extend the Alaska program to all other remote areas in the Continental United States.

The use of remote Indian health centers will promote greater areawide health programming where restricted access exists at present. Additionally, the use of such facilities by nonbeneficiaries will assure fuller utilization of these expensive facilities, thereby achieving operating economies. Control of the hospitals would remain the responsibility of the Division of Indian Health thereby maintaining the desired quality of care. The primary mission of the hospital would remain the quality medical care of the Indian community.

Under the proposed bill, the health

services provided would be supportive in nature. The bill does not in any way anticipate Federal usurpation of State, local, community, or private prerogative and responsibilities.

It is not anticipated the enactment of this proposal would add to the costs of the Federal Government as services would be provided in a "space available basis" and would be reimbursable.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1802. A bill relating to certain authority of the Joint Committee on Printing. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BROOKS BILL AMENDMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to restore to the Joint Committee on Printing authority for the procurement of marginally punched continuous forms.

The act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1127, 40 U.S.C. 759(e)) gave the Administrator, General Services Administration, the authority to coordinate acquisition of automatic data processing equipment and related supplies for all Federal agencies and incidentally deleted the exemption heretofore granted to the Joint Committee on Printing under section 602(d)(18) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 474(18)). That act has had the effect of encroaching upon the Joint Committee's exclusive authority over printing and binding for the Federal Government. This bill is intended to restore that authority.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1803. A bill to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay and allowances to employees of the Government Printing Office. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

WAIVER OF CLAIMS—GPO

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay and allowances to employees of the Government Printing Office. Section 5584, title 5, United States Code, authorizes the waiver in whole or part of erroneous payments of pay and allowances to employees of executive agencies when collection would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interests of the United States. The Government Printing Office, however, is in the legislative branch and, as a result, the relief granted by that act is not extended to employees of the Government Printing Office. This bill would remedy that situation.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1804. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees. Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill designed to permit the immediate retirement of certain Federal employees during a major reduction in force in a department or agency.

This measure would permit the optional retirement on reduced annuity of Federal employees with at least 25 years of service or, after becoming 50 years of age, with at least 20 years of service.

Under present law, an employee who is at least 50 years of age and has at least 20 years of service—or 25 years of service regardless of age—may retire on an immediate annuity if he is involuntarily separated. This may happen when he is reached by reduction-in-force action. However, unless the employee is old enough and has sufficient service to retire optionally—age 55 with 30 years of service, age 60 with 20 years of service, or age 62 with 5 years of service—he does not have the right to retire if he is not reached for reduction in force. In other words, even if the employee wants to retire, he may not do so unless he is actually reached for reduction in force. Consequently, under present law, an employee who is not old enough and does not have sufficient service may not retire—even if he is desirous of doing so—and thus permit a younger employee who wants to continue to work to be retained.

Mr. President, my bill would simply give the long-service employee who is not eligible to retire under the regular optional retirement provision of law the opportunity to retire voluntarily during a limited period when his department is undergoing a major reduction in force.

Under my bill, the Civil Service Commission would be authorized to make the determination as to when a reduction in force is major and would also fix the time within which employees could exercise the option to retire. In addition, the Commission will be responsible for making a determination as to whether eligible employees throughout the department could exercise the option to retire, or whether the option to retire would be restricted to eligible employees of the department who are employed in specific geographic areas or organizational units where the effects of the reduction in force are particularly severe.

Like Federal employees who are involuntarily separated, those who exercise the option to retire voluntarily in a major reduction in force will have their annuities reduced by one-sixth of 1 percent—2 percent a year—for each month they are under age 55.

Mr. President, my bill would be of tremendous benefit to employees, employers, and the community in which a Federal installation undergoing a reduction in force is located. As lawmakers and representatives of our respective States, we are all very familiar with how reductions in force have a depressing effect on employee morale and result in severe personal hardships caused by loss of income and uncertainty regarding future employment.

In addition, major reductions in force, through multiple "bumping" actions, have a disruptive effect on departmental management. However, to the extent that attrition, particularly retirement, reduces the need for involuntary separations—and the chain-effect displacement of employees with lower retention rights by those with higher retention rights—

these economic hardships nad disruptions are mitigated.

Experience has shown that in a community where a Federal installation is a main source of employment, a major reduction in force may adversely affect the community's economy and well-being. Consequently, permitting people to retire on an annuity income and spreading voluntary retirements throughout an entire department or agency, as my bill proposes to do, would at least moderate the adverse effects of reductions in force on a particular community.

Another far-reaching benefit to be derived from my bill will be the opportunity it gives each department to enhance its future effectiveness in carrying out its responsibility by helping to retain younger employees. Under present law, nothing raises the average age of an organization more quickly than a substantial reduction in force in which the youngest employees with the lowest retention standing are separated and the oldest employees are retained.

Mr. President, in view of the recent announcement by the Pentagon to close many military bases around our country, the measure that I am introducing today becomes more urgent and important. Since October 1969, the Defense Department has been in a continuing period of declining civilian employment with approximately 300,000 civilian positions being eliminated.

In view of current and projected budgetary restrictions—and the need to adjust the predominantly civilian staffed support structure to the reductions taking place in the size of our Armed Forces—it is anticipated that many civilian positions will be affected by elimination or relocation. Consequently, my bill would be of great benefit to those who might be affected by reductions in force by permitting long-service employees who desire to retire, but not yet eligible to do so under present optional retirement provisions, to retire during a major reduction in force.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission supports this bill and the Department of Defense strongly endorses it. I am not aware of any opposition to the intent and purpose of the bill.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities; to change the railroad retirement tax rates; and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the act, and for other purposes. Referred by unanimous consent jointly to the Committees on Commerce, Finance, and Labor and Public Welfare.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Unless legislation is enacted soon to ratify the railroad labor-management wage and benefit agreement of March 1973, almost 2 million retired railroad workers, their dependents, and survivors will face severe cutbacks in railroad retirement benefits. The legislation I am introducing today

would, by confirming the railroad pact, assure railroad workers of adequate retirement benefits, lower their retirement taxes, and set a lower voluntary retirement age without any reduction in retirement benefits.

The men and women who have been working on the railroad during their working years deserve the opportunity to spend their retirement years in comfort and security. Over 2,300 retired railroad workers in Connecticut depend on railroad benefits as their source of retirement income. Another 3,500 children and widows of deceased railroad workers also depend on this retirement system. All of these people will suffer cutbacks in benefits unless Federal legislation is enacted to ratify the bargaining agreement by July 1. Another 4,000 active Connecticut railroad employees also have a stake in an equitable retirement system. Today these workers are paying almost twice as much out of their paychecks for railroad retirement as others do for social security.

Both labor and management have recognized these problems. In March of this year, representatives of railroad labor and management reached agreement on a new 18-month national railroad pact concerning wages, health, welfare, pension, and other benefits. The present agreements expire on June 30 and the new one cannot take effect unless ratified by Congress.

The three major issues resolved in the March bargaining and included in this bill are retirement benefit levels, retirement tax levels, and retirement age.

First, the bill would extend the temporary retirement benefit increases enacted by Congress in the last 3 years through December 31, 1974. The benefit increases of the last few years have been enacted in order to assure that railroad retirement benefits merely are kept in line with the rising cost of living and rising social security benefits. Late last year, for example, we enacted over the President's veto a proposal to provide a railroad benefit increase which would match the 20-percent social security increase. There is no reason why railroad benefit increases should not be as permanent as hikes in social security benefits.

The legislation also assures that if any additional benefits are added to social security between now and the end of 1974 they will also be added to the railroad retirement system.

The second part of this proposal would cut back railroad retirement taxes on employees in order to bring them in line with social security taxes. Under the railroad retirement system, employees have to contribute 10.6 percent of payroll—with employers paying an equivalent amount. Under social security employees and employers each pay only 5.35 percent. As a result of the March 1973 pact the employers have agreed, effective October 1, 1973, to pick up all costs to the employee above 5.35 percent. This means that the employee contribution rate would decrease by 4.75 percent—from 10.6 to 5.35 percent. This provision will add \$42.75 per month to the paychecks of railroad workers who now contribute the maximum amount to the system;

4,000 Connecticut workers and their families would receive an immediate boost in their take-home pay if this bill becomes law.

The third provision in this proposal would allow railroad employees with 30 years of service to retire at age 60 with full retirement benefits. This provision presently applies only to women. Not only will the average workers be able to enjoy his retirement years more fully, but more jobs will become available for younger workers as well. The railroad agreement ratified by this bill may become a trend setter in lowering the voluntary retirement age of millions of older Americans.

It is of utmost importance to all railroad workers, active and retired, as well as their families that this legislation be enacted before July 1, 1973. At that time the benefit increases enacted by Congress will expire unless this proposal is adopted. This would mean a benefit cut of over 50 percent. Such a cutback would be unconscionable.

I am pleased that identical legislation H.R. 7200, has been introduced and reported out of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees by HARLEY STAGGERS, Democratic, of West Virginia.

Mr. RIBICOFF subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, which is being introduced today, be jointly referred to the Committees on Finance, Commerce, and Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIDEN). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By Mr. TUNNEY (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASKELL, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1807. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a program of salinity control for the Colorado River, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT OF 1973

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement a program for the control of salinity in the waters of the Colorado River system. This legislation is cosponsored by Senators CRANSTON, BENNETT, BIBLE, DOMINICK, DOMINICK, GOLDWATER, HANSEN, HASKELL, MCGEE, MONTOYA, and MOSS.

For the past 9 years in Congress, I have represented cities and major farming areas which are heavily dependent upon the Colorado River for their water supply. The Imperial and Coachella Valleys are two of the Nation's most important farming areas solely because irrigation water is available from the Colorado River. Los Angeles, San Diego, Riverside, and scores of other southern California cities and towns have utilized water from the Colorado River to sup-

The Federal Diary

THE WASHINGTON POST

Tuesday, Dec. 10 1974

B13

Promotion Guidelines Being Drawn



By
**Mike
Causey**

The White House is working on a special hold-the-line message for federal agency heads that will order them to slow—but not freeze—promotions.

Presidential aides have, for the past 10 days, been studying draft language they requested from the Civil Service Commission dealing with the problem of grade creep. That term refers to the tendency of both industry and government to promote people or reclassify jobs until the organizational pyramid tends to get out of shape in the middle and upper end. More chiefs than Indians, if you will.

The rather steady increase in the average grade in government is partly because technological changes have ended the days when the bureaucracy was an army of clerks. Today there are about as many scientific and technical employees in government as there are clerical workers.

In a normal 12-month period, around 400,000 of the government's 2.6 million civilians gets some kind of a promotion. Many of those are standard longevity increases, which are fixed by law. But even so, that is a promotion ratio that out-strips most private corporations.

As we reported here Nov. 15, Mr. Ford scuttled plans for a temporary civilian-military promotion freeze. The action had been seriously considered, but top federal and military brass argued that it would be disruptive. Instead, they asked the White House to give them guidelines, and a change to the rules to tighten promotions.

Mr. Ford, insiders say, has agreed that a flat promotion ban would cause problems within the bureaucracy. Instead, his aides, asked the Civil Service Commission for recommended language on a get-tough promotion directive. CSC brass won't divulge the contents of their recommendations on grounds it would be improper to scoop the President.

Other sources say, however, that Mr. Ford "concluded that no action was to be taken on a promotion freeze, and that he asked for a memo to send to departments and agencies telling them to help reduce rising personnel costs and to give them leadership and remind them to pay attention to promotions." It is expected to go to cabinet level officials and agency heads any time now.

Thomas Donahue, executive assistant to AFL-CIO president George Meany is the luncheon speaker today at the Society of Federal Labor Relations Professionals meeting. Donahue will talk about the new public employees department of the AFL-CIO. The meeting is at the Empress Restaurant.

Executive Retirement Proposal: With the odds against any sort of an executive federal pay raise in the near future, government supergraders have revived their retirement credit plan. They hope some member of Congress will get behind the idea which would cost the government very little.

It would work like this: The salaries of government workers at Grade 16, 17 and 18 would remain frozen. But they would be given credit on retirement for salaries they should be earning, according to the government's comparability - with - industry formula. Under that formula, Grade 18 employees who are now limited to \$36,000 should be given credit for the higher salary, but their annuities (which are based on the average of the highest three years of service) would be figured on the higher amount. Employees enrolled in the plan would pay 7 per cent of their annual salary, based on the \$44,000 figure, although their actual earnings would remain at \$36,000 until Congress raises them.

Federal policy-makers have in the past opposed the retirement credit proposal. They are against it mainly because they think it would be an under-cover fringe benefit (although justified), and could lessen the pressure on Congress to raise executive pay next year.

But if the pay freeze continues much longer, somebody in Congress will probably introduce the retirement-credit plan as a bill. If the Ford administration should decide to back it, it will mean the White House has given up hope for a 1975 super-grade pay raise.

Rank Has Its (Exit) Privileges: Workers at the Defense Mapping Agency in Bethesda complain that they are subjected to a daily traffic snarl so a few military bosses can get a head start.

The workers say that certain exits at the mammoth complex are blocked each day at the 4 p.m. quitting time, so some of their leaders can get on Sangamore Road or MacArthur Boulevard first. The result, the employees complain, is a traffic bottleneck for the peons.

DMA brass contend that the standard 4 p.m. quitting time is an energy-saving device, and that the reshuffle of parking spaces and exit patterns is to encourage car pools.

NR 6078

D 429

April 24, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, receiving further testimony from the nominee.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

NOMINATION

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nomination of Robert E. Holding, of Wyoming, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee concluded hearings on H.R. 6078, extending provisions of law relating to civil service retirement of certain employees engaged in hazardous occupations to customs and immigration inspectors; and H.R. 9281, to provide improved retirement benefits for Federal law enforcement and firefighting personnel, after receiving testimony from Senators Percy and Dole; Representative Brasco; Thomas A. Tinsley, Director, Bureau of Retirement, Insurance, and Occupational Health, Civil Service Commission; John Ryan, Federal Criminal Investigators' Association, Bristol, Conn.; W. H. McClennon, who was accompanied by Jack A. Waller and Fred Schillreff, all representing the International Association of Firefighters, Washington, D.C.; Eugene Rossides, Washington, D.C.; Joseph Gamble, Washington, D.C.; Clyde M. Webber, who was accompanied by Carl Sadler and James H. Lynch, Jr., all representing the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.; Nathan Wolkomir, National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D.C.; John J. Murphy, National Customs Association, Washington, D.C.; Mary Gereau, representing the National Treasury Employees' Union, Washington, D.C.; Ordway P. Burden, New York City; and Edward J. Kiernan, International Conference of Police Associations, Washington, D.C.

WATER PROJECTS

Committee on Public Works: Subcommittee on Water Resources concluded hearings on three bills, after receiving testimony as follows:

S. 2668, to modify the project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, N.C., with testimony from Senator Helms; Dr. Arthur W. Cooper, Department of Natural and Economic Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh; Mayor Clarence Lightner, of Raleigh; Mayor pro tempore Nathan Yelton, of Garner, N.C.; Mayor Fredrick Bond, of Cary, N.C.; and Howard E. Manning, Raleigh;

S. 3141, authorizing construction of the Clinton Parkway, Douglas County, Kans., with testimony from Senators Pearson and Dole; Walter Cragan, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, Kans.; Mayor Jack Rose, of Lawrence, Kans.; and Chuck Fisher, Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Kans.; and

S. 3262, to provide a facility for a whitewater canoe-kayak slalom course adjacent to the site of Captain Meldahl locks and dam, Ohio River, with testimony from Senator Taft; and Mrs. Robert McEwan, U.S. Olympic Kayak and Canoe Committee.

Also, committee received testimony on these bills from Brig. Gen. James L. Kelly, Deputy Director, and Irvin Reisler, Chief, Planning Division, both of the Office of Civil Works, Army Corps of Engineers.

PAPERWORK BURDEN

Select Committee on Small Business: Committee resumed hearings on the Federal paperwork burden, receiving testimony from Howard Schulte, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health; Laurence C. Brown, Cove-Craft, Inc., Laconia, N.H.; and Charles O. Strickler, Rocco, Inc., Harrisonburg, Va.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 53 public bills, H.R. 14332-14384; 2 private bills, H.R. 14385 and 14386; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 986, H. Con. Res. 481, and H. Res. 1059-1061, were introduced.

Pages H 3195-H 3197

Bill Reported: One report was filed as follows: H.R. 8193, to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels, amended (H. Rept. 93-1003).

Page H 3195

Late Report: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries received permission to file a report by midnight tonight on H.R. 8193, to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

Page H 3093

Presidential Message—Foreign Aid: Received and read a message from the President wherein he proposes foreign aid legislation—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 93-293).

Pages H 3094-H 3096

Military Pay: By a voice vote, the House agreed to the conference report on S. 2771, to revise the special pay bonus structure relating to members of the Armed Forces, clearing the measure for the President.

Pages H 3096-H 3097

Arms Control and Disarmament Authorization: By a voice vote, the House passed H.R. 12799, to authorize appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

Agreed to the first three committee amendments.

D 430

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—DAILY DIGEST

April 24, 1974

Rejected the fourth committee amendment that sought to require arms control impact statements (rejected by a recorded vote of 152 ayes to 239 noes).

Pages H 3097—H 3108

Civil Service Annuitants: By a yea-and-nay vote of 296 yeas to 102 nays with 3 voting "present," the House passed S. 628, to eliminate the annuity reduction made, in order to provide a surviving spouse with an annuity, during periods when the annuitant is not married.

Agreed to the committee amendment;

Agreed to an amendment to the committee amendment that extends coverage to a spouse married for a total of 1 year to the employee at the time of retirement and the time of death; and

Agreed to amend the title of the bill.

H. Res. 1010, the rule under which the bill was considered was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 363 yeas to 30 nays with 2 voting "present."

Pages H 3111—H 3119

Public Safety Officers' Benefits: By a yea-and-nay vote of 320 yeas to 54 nays, the House passed H.R. 11321, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty.

Rejected a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary (rejected by a recorded vote of 77 ayes to 300 noes).

Agreed to the committee amendments.

Rejected:

A substitute amendment that contains the provisions of H.R. 6449;

An amendment that sought to make the bill effective on the date of enactment in lieu of October 11, 1972 (rejected by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 191 noes); and

An amendment that sought to require the Federal Government to pay a gratuity equal to that provided by a State or local government not to exceed a combined total of \$50,000 (rejected by a division vote of 48 ayes to 107 noes).

Subsequently, this passage was vacated and S. 15, a similar Senate-passed bill was passed in lieu after being amended to contain the language of the House bill as passed. Agreed to amend the title of the Senate bill.

H. Res. 1056, the rule under which the bill was considered, was agreed to earlier by a voice vote.

Pages H 3119—H 3150

Referrals: Two Senate-passed measures were referred to the appropriate House committees.

Page H 3195

Quorum Calls—Votes: One quorum call, three yea-and-nay votes, and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H3096, H3107, H3109, H3118—H3119, H3145, and H3147—H3148.

Program for Thursday: Met at noon and adjourned at 7:44 p.m. until noon on Thursday, April 25, when the House will consider H.R. 13999, National Science Foundation authorization (open rule, 1 hour of debate);

H.R. 13998, National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization (open rule, 1 hour of debate); and H.R. 11989, Fire Prevention and Control Act (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

Committee Meetings

COTTON MARKETING SYSTEM

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Cotton continued hearings on the Nation's cotton marketing system with testimony from public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

PEANUT PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice held a hearing on the peanut program and heard testimony from public witnesses.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on military personnel, Navy.

HEW APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor-HEW continued hearings on 1975 HEW items.

AGRICULTURE—ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection held a hearing with testimony from Members of Congress and public witnesses.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction continued hearings on Department of the Navy.

PUBLIC WORKS—AEC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Public Works-AEC continued hearings with Members of Congress and public witnesses.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary held a hearing on the Department of State.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Urban Mass Transit Administration.

TREASURY APPROPRIATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government held a hearing on the Administrative Conference of the United States.

E 3102

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

May 10, 1973

handled delicately yet in a straight-forward manner. With a subject which requires both sensitivity and frankness, the accomplishment of these goals was truly genius."

ABRAHAM J. TWERSKI, M.D.,
St. Francis General Hospital.

"Congratulations . . . to KQV. I believe this type of public approach is most needed in all areas of medical and social dilemma that our society is currently faced with."

JOSEPH J. JACKLINE, JR., M.D.

"... a concern I share with others is the need for increasing public awareness of and promoting interest in the problem of alcoholism. . . . I feel 'One for the Road' was an excellent effort in attempting to accomplish this goal."

BERNADETTE CONNOR,
Instructor, University of Pittsburgh.

"... Shows of this type provide much-needed information regarding not only alcoholism but the development of responsible drinking habits within our society."

CHARLES J. NINOS,
Director, Consultation-Education
Services, St. Joseph Hospital.

"... Programs such as the one presented by your station are powerful techniques for accomplishing the goal of alcoholism prevention through community education. Congratulations on a job well done."

KENNETH S. RAMSEY,
Director, Alcoholism Treatment
Center, St. Joseph's Hospital.

"... It was a pleasure while visiting in Pittsburgh to listen in on your station's presentation 'One for the Road.' At present, I am on Governor Rockefeller's Council on Alcoholism and have been associated with various programs for the past 20 years. I have heard many programs, but for depth and beauty of presentation, this was undoubtedly the very best."

JAY SIMS,
City of New York, Department
of Correction.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today everywhere in the free world the Rumanian people are celebrating a national holiday, commemorating the founding of the Kingdom of Rumania and the achievement of national independence. This celebration is especially important to those of Rumanian ancestry because their great desire for freedom has been suppressed by the Communist regime in their homeland.

On May 10, 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania, culminating a long struggle of the Rumanian people to gain this right. Rumania declared its complete independence from the Ottoman Empire 11 years later, on May 10, 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War. This status was confirmed by European nations at the Conference of Berlin of 1878. Four years after this, on May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned as the first king, by the will of the people. Thus began the Kingdom of Rumania, which

represented a free and prosperous period for the Rumanian people.

Throughout the entire period from 1881 to the present, May 10 has been a time to celebrate the achievement of freedom for the Rumanian people. It is also the symbol of the struggle for freedom which the Rumanian people have endured in the past and are continuing. I join with all Rumanians in the celebration of this great event in their history, and in their efforts toward the freedom which they so much cherish.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the independent State of Israel. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the citizens of Israel and the Jewish people all over the world whose personal contributions have brought such great accomplishments and successes to the State of Israel since 1948. At this occasion, I would also like to offer my best wishes to Israel for continued achievements and good fortune in the years to come.

Beginning in the latter part of the 19th century, Jewish emigrants from Europe returned in increasing numbers to their ancestral homeland, which was then under the administration of the Turkish Ottoman Empire. Following World War I, the region known as Palestine came under British administration, and the menacing surge of European religious persecution in the 1930's gave impetus to thousands of Jewish refugees to seek haven there. During World War II, Jewish residents of Palestine fought bravely alongside the Allies in the desert war against the Nazi enemy.

The genocidal tragedy which was inflicted upon the Jewish people in Europe during World War II drove growing streams of survivors of that holocaust to Palestine. By 1947, tensions between Arab and Jewish inhabitants of the area had grown to the boiling point. Great Britain proposed to the United Nations that her mandate over the territory be terminated and that Palestine be partitioned between the Arab and Jewish communities. Bloodshed and chaos increased, the United Nations failed to devise an operative plan for partition, and in May of 1948 the State of Israel declared its independence. The Israelis gallantly resisted and overcame the armed aggression by neighboring Arab states which followed immediately upon Israel's independence, and from this birth of persecution and violence, the State of Israel grew to become a powerful, economically advanced member of the international community.

Today, Israel presents to the world a true story of success in surmounting enormous obstacles and adversity. The nation possesses an excellent educational system, a highly advanced standard of

national medical care, impressive industrial development, thriving agricultural production, and a vigorous democratic political structure.

Israel is a loyal friend of the United States, and it is America's responsibility to help insure, by making arms and aircraft available and through economic aid, that the antagonisms harbored by her Arab neighbors do not imperil the existence and integrity of the State of Israel.

The vital role which Israel played in the World War II era, as a haven for victims of anti-Jewish persecution, continues to be a strong national purpose. Jewish people from the Arab countries, from Eastern Europe, and from the Soviet Union look to Israel as their true homeland, and the tide of immigration by Jews in the Diaspora continues in force. It is heartening to note that U.S. congressional pressures to guarantee the right of worldwide emigration to Israel are strong and determined. I am proud that last year the Congress enacted my proposal to authorize \$85 million in aid to Israel for the resettlement of Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union, of which amount \$45 million was eventually appropriated. Today I am introducing legislation to authorize an additional \$36½ million for this important purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Jewish people and the State of Israel is a shining example of courage, determination, and enormous accomplishment. Congratulations to Israel on her 25th anniversary, and may her strength and achievements flourish through the centuries to come.

H.R. 7231SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR FEDERAL
EMPLOYEES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation for a comprehensive set of benefits to aid all Federal employees who are adversely affected by reductions in force. A most striking example of the impact upon individuals caused by Government decisions to cut back involves the Defense Department's recent action.

Last month, the Secretary of Defense announced 274 actions which will affect military bases in the United States. Most of these involve base closures or the transfer of jobs from one area to another. Hardest hit in economic terms will be Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and my own State of California.

Some 40,000 military and civilian jobs will be lost nationwide. In my own State, 9,500 civilian positions will be affected; some 8,000 jobs actually will be eliminated. In a State where 525,000 people are already unemployed, this is a harsh addition. But statistics tend to blind us to the true meaning of such facts. Real people will lose their jobs; their lives will be substantially affected, their standards of living usually reduced. In the Hunters

May 10, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 310

ON BILINGUAL COURTS BILL

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today, I, with Mr. EDWARDS of California, as co-sponsor, have introduced a bill, the bilingual courts bill, which represents a necessary first step toward insuring that non-English speaking minorities will fully comprehend, be able to participate in, and have full access to the judicial process and related proceedings.

This bill represents a legislative continuation of a principle enunciated by the Supreme Court during the last decade. In *Gideon* against *Wainwright*, the Court stated that due process required that an indigent accused of a felony, must be provided with an attorney at his trial. The underlying rationale of this decision was that in order to insure fairness and participation of the accused in his trial, it was necessary to provide him with the basic tools to adequately present his case to the Court.

Since *Gideon*, the Supreme Court has utilized this rationale to continuously expand the services which must be provided the accused indigent. Today an indigent must be given a transcript of his trial to facilitate his appeal, and can have an attorney appointed to try his appeal from conviction. There are other cases which will soon reach the Court that could lead to the Government's having to supply many other types of services to the indigent to insure he is fairly tried.

Today, there are more than nine million people in this country who speak Spanish. In many ways the bilingual American, one who speaks English, but whose native and everyday language is not English, faces the same problems in his encounters with the judicial system as the indigent did before the decision on *Gideon*.

A report of the Civil Rights Commission in 1970, Mexican-Americans and the administration of justice in the Southwest, concluded that the language barrier and cultural differences of the Spanish-speaking have severely handicapped the bilingual American at every stage of the legal judicial process—at the arrest stage, at the time of trial and even when he seeks parole.

At present, there are State and Federal statutes that do provide some services to the non-English speaking. However, these statutes have not provided adequate or enough services. Oftentimes the trial judge is given complete discretion as to when those services should be provided.

It is now time for the Federal Government to insure that every individual—whether he suffers from a financial or a linguistic handicap—has access to the fairest trial possible under our judicial system.

I believe that the bill I have introduced today will be a first step in achieving the goal of equal access to the judicial system.

The bill first provides that the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts must determine each of those judicial districts in which at least 5 percent or 50,000 of the residents of the district do not speak or understand the English language with reasonable facility, and certify each such district as a bilingual judicial district. Next he must prescribe for each such district the qualifications of interpreters who have a capacity for accurate speech and comprehension in English and in the non-English language, and for simultaneous translation from either language to the other. Next he must prescribe a schedule of reasonable fees for interpreters and provide such district with appropriate equipment and facilities, so the interpreter can carry out his duties.

Second, whenever a district judge determines upon motion made by a party to a proceeding in a judicial district certified as bilingual that the party does not speak and understand English with reasonable facility or that testimony may be presented by any person who does not speak or understand English, he may order the proceedings shall be conducted with the services of an interpreter who can provide simultaneous translation of the entire proceeding.

The parties to the proceeding who use the interpreter shall bear the cost. If an indigent utilizes the services, then the Government will bear the cost.

ISRAEL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the commemoration of the joyous 25th anniversary of the State of Israel. This brave country, faced with a continuing struggle for sheer existence, has acted with determination and fortitude to provide the Jewish people with a true homeland.

I have been fortunate enough to have traveled throughout Israel, and to have seen the magnificent accomplishments of this nation. What was once a vast desert wasteland has become a beautiful oasis. The devotion and love Israelis have for their country is strikingly apparent in the warm reception that visitors receive.

Israel is more than a country. It is a dream fulfilled for millions of Jews throughout the world. Jews in the Diaspora, some of whom would make any sacrifice just to live in the "promised land," are unfortunately forbidden to emigrate because of oppressive laws in countries not enjoying the freedom that Israel grants all of her residents.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the immense privilege of meeting many Israeli leaders, including the distinguished Premier, Golda Meir. That was an experience that I shall always treasure. The people of Israel are fortunate to have this great lady at the helm of their country.

I fervently wish that this anniversary could signal the assurance of a lasting

peace in the Middle East. The great success of this country is too often muddled by the horrors of war. Now is the time for Israel to reap the harvest of its 2 years of dedication. I know that I speak for all Americans in praising the achievements of the past 25 years and in expressing my heartfelt desire for the realization of all future goals.

KQV SALUTED FOR AWARD-WINNING PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMING

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, KQV Radio, the American Broadcasting Co.-owned station in Pittsburgh, has long had the reputation as the leading public service-minded facility in Allegheny County, part of which, the 18th District, I represent.

KQV has produced and broadcast a major 2-hour documentary entitled "One for the Road," which deals with alcoholism. I have had the pleasure of listening to the record album which has resulted from this broadcast and I take this opportunity to commend the station, its general manager, John D. Gibbs, and his staff for an outstanding contribution to trying to solve a major social and medical problem.

Although the use of hard drugs, stimulants, and hallucinogenics receives wide publicity and attention today, the No. 1 abused drug in this country is alcohol.

Alcohol now affects some 40 million persons in the United States and the loss to business runs close to \$15 million annually.

KQV, in attempting to educate the public and perform a vital public service, conducted some 150 interviews, including physicians, psychiatrists, members of Alcoholics Anonymous, and ordinary "social drinkers."

After it's first broadcast, "One for the Road" stimulated countless requests for rebroadcast and the station responded accordingly.

Since that time, "One for the Road" has been honored with several awards; namely, two Golden Quills this week, bestowed by western Pennsylvania journalistic societies, for "best radio documentary" and "best of all radio shows." Additionally, the program was honored by the Pennsylvania Associated Press as "best public affairs program" and Theta Sigma Phi, an organization of women in communications, as "best documentary in radio and TV."

I would like to share with my colleagues excerpts from just a few of the many letters KQV received from listeners saluting it for its powerful "One for the Road":

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS OF KQV-RADIO

"... I wish to compliment you on a most comprehensive and instructive public education program. Since many people have commented on the program to me, I am not alone in my evaluation. The material was

May 10, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 3103

Point Naval Shipyard closing, a large number of the 5,184 employees whose jobs will disappear are members of ethnic minorities, who will be hit at just the same time urban programs for their area are also being cut. In southern California, Long Beach stands to lose some \$50 million in annual payroll by the closure of its naval base.

The losses elsewhere are also great. Massachusetts will lose 9,000 jobs on top of an unemployment rate of 7.4 percent, and Rhode Island, 4,661 jobs over and above a current jobless rate of 6.4 percent.

I am pleased to introduce a bill which will cause the Government to act with compassion when Federal employees who have been displaced cannot readily find new employment. It would guarantee certain levels of pay and health benefits while the former employee seeks work, thus avoiding a series of personal financial catastrophes. It would provide for training and counseling, for early retirement where that is appropriate, and for relocation allowances. The bill, in short, would mitigate the burdens placed upon individuals by decisions of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7731

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide special assistance and benefits to Federal employees involuntarily separated through reductions in force, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Emergency Assistance Act of 1973".

Sec. 2. Subpart F of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 80—ASSISTANCE TO EMPLOYEES SEPARATED THROUGH REDUCTION IN FORCE

"Sec.

"8001. Definitions.

"8002. Application for assistance.

"8003. Readjustment allowances; qualifying requirements.

"8004. Readjustment allowances; weekly amounts.

"8005. Readjustment allowances; time limitations.

"8006. Readjustment allowances; application of State laws.

"8007. Job training and counseling; purpose; applications.

"8008. Payments related to training.

"8009. Relocation allowance.

"8010. Early retirement.

"8011. Health benefits.

"§ 8001. Definitions

"For the purposes of this chapter—

"(1) 'employee' means an individual who has been totally or partially separated from employment by an executive agency on or after April 17, 1973, because of the transfer of activities from a facility of that agency or because of the cessation of activities at a facility of that agency and who has not obtained other suitable employment;

"(2) 'average weekly wage' means one-thirteenth of the total wages paid to an employee in the high quarter; for purposes of this computation, the high quarter shall be that quarter in which the employee's total wages were highest among the first 4 of the last 5 completed calendar quarters immediately before the quarter in which occurs the week with respect to which the computation

is made, such week shall be the week in which total separation occurred, or, in cases where partial separation is claimed, an appropriate week, as defined in regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission;

"(3) 'partial separation' means, with respect to an employee who has not been totally separated, that he has had his hours of work reduced to 85 per centum or less of his average weekly hours in a facility subject to this chapter and his wages reduced to 85 per centum or less of his average weekly wage in any such facility;

"(4) 'total separation' means the layoff or severance of an employee from employment in a facility subject to this chapter;

"(5) 'remuneration' means wages and net earnings derived from services performed as a self-employed individual;

"(6) 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

"(7) 'State law' means the unemployment insurance law of the State approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

"(8) 'unemployment insurance' means the unemployment insurance payable to an individual under any State law or Federal unemployment insurance law, including title XV of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

"(9) 'week' means a week as defined in the applicable State law; and

"(10) 'week of unemployment' means with respect to an individual any week for which his remuneration for services performed during such week is less than 75 per centum of his average weekly wage and in which, because of lack of work—

"(A) if he has been totally separated, he worked less than the full-time week (excluding overtime) in his current occupation, or

"(B) if he has been partially separated, he worked 75 per centum or less of his average weekly hours.

"§ 8002. Application for assistance

"(a) An employee may file an application with the Civil Service Commission for one or more of the forms of assistance provided under this chapter.

"(b) The Commission shall determine whether an employee is entitled to receive the assistance for which application is made and shall furnish such assistance if the employee is so entitled. Such determination shall be made as soon as possible after the date on which application is filed but in any event not later than 30 days after such date.

"§ 8003. Readjustment allowances; qualifying requirements

"Payment of a readjustment allowance shall be made to an employee who applies for such allowance for any week of unemployment, provided—

"(1) total or partial separation of the employee has occurred not more than 1 year prior to the date of the application for assistance under this title; and

"(2) the employee has had—

"(A) in the 156 weeks immediately preceding such total or partial separation, at least 78 weeks of employment at wages of \$15 or more a week;

"(B) in the 52 weeks immediately preceding such total or partial separation, at least 26 weeks of employment at wages of \$15 or more a week; or

"(C) if data with respect to weeks of employment are not available, equivalent amounts of employment computed under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

"§ 8004. Readjustment allowances; weekly amounts

"(a) Unless otherwise provided by this section, the readjustment allowance payable to an employee for a week of unemployment shall be an amount equal to 75 per centum

of his average weekly wage, reduced by 50 per centum of the amount of his remuneration for services performed during such week.

"(b) An employee who is entitled to readjustment allowances and who is undergoing training approved by the Civil Service Commission, including on-the-job training, shall receive for each week in which he is undergoing any such training, a readjustment allowance in an amount (computed for such week) equal to the amount computed under subsection (a) of this section or (if greater) the amount of any weekly allowance for such training to which he would be entitled under any other Federal law for the training of employees, if he applied for such allowance. Such readjustment allowance shall be paid in lieu of any training allowance to which the employee would be entitled under such other Federal law.

"(c) The amount of readjustment allowance payable to an employee under subsection (a) or (b) of this section for any week shall be reduced by any amount of unemployment insurance which he has received or is seeking with respect to such week; but, if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that the employee was not entitled to unemployment insurance with respect to such week, the reduction shall not apply with respect to such week.

"(d) The amount of readjustment allowance payable to an employee under subsection (a) or (b) of this section for any week shall be reduced by any amount of retirement annuity which he has received.

"(e) If unemployment insurance, a retirement annuity, or a training allowance under any other Federal law, is paid to an employee for any week of unemployment with respect to which he would be entitled (determined without regard to subsection (c) of this section) to a readjustment allowance if he applied for such allowance, each such week shall be deducted from the total number of weeks of readjustment allowance otherwise payable to him under section 8005(a) of this title when he applies for a readjustment allowance and is determined to be entitled to such allowance. If the unemployment insurance or the training allowance paid to such employee for any week of unemployment is less than the amount of the readjustment allowance to which he would be entitled if he applied for such allowance, he shall receive, when he applies for a readjustment allowance and is determined to be entitled to such allowance, a readjustment allowance for such week equal to such difference.

"(f) Whenever, with respect to any week of unemployment, the total amount payable to an employee as remuneration for services performed during such week, as unemployment insurance as severance pay, as a training allowance referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and as a readjustment allowance would exceed his average weekly wage, his readjustment allowance for such week shall be reduced by the amount of such excess.

"(g) The amount of any weekly payment to be made under this section which is not a whole dollar amount shall be rounded upward to the next higher whole dollar amount.

"§ 8005. Readjustment allowances; time limitations

"(a) Payment of readjustment allowances shall not be made to an employee for more than 52 weeks.

"(b) A readjustment allowance shall not be paid for a week of unemployment beginning more than 1 year after the beginning of the appropriate week. The appropriate week for a totally separated employee is the week of his most recent total separation. The appropriate week for a partially separated employee is the week in respect of which he first receives a readjustment allowance following his most recent partial separation.

E 3104

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

May 10, 1973

"§ 8006. Readjustment allowances; application of State laws

"Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter and subject to such regulations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, the availability and disqualification provisions of the State law—

"(1) under which an employee is entitled to unemployment insurance (whether or not he has filed a claim for such insurance), or

"(2) if he is not so entitled to unemployment insurance, of the State in which he was totally or partially separated,

shall apply to any such employee who files a claim for readjustment allowances. The State law so determined with respect to a separation of an employee shall remain applicable, for purposes of the preceding sentence, with respect to such separation until such employee becomes entitled to unemployment insurance under another State law (whether or not he has filed a claim for such insurance).

"§ 8007. Job training and counseling; purpose; applications

(a) An employee who applies for a readjustment allowance under section 8003 of this title shall also apply for counseling, training, and placement assistance under this section. Any other employee may apply for counseling, training, and placement assistance under this section. Each employee shall be furnished such counseling, training, and placement services as the Civil Service Commission determines to be appropriate.

"(b) Insofar as possible, the Commission shall provide assistance under subsection (a) of this section through existing programs established by law. To the extent that assistance cannot be provided through any existing program, the Commission is authorized to furnish such assistance through programs established by the Commission for purposes of this section, including programs carried out through private nonprofit institutions and organizations.

"(c) To the extent practicable, before employees are furnished training, the Commission shall consult with local governmental agencies, State agencies, unions, and private business organizations to develop an employee retraining plan which provides for training such employees to meet the area's manpower needs. An employee retraining program shall, as far as practicable, include a list of jobs which will be available to the employees at the conclusion of the training program.

"§ 8008. Payments related to training

"An employee who receives training under section 8007 of this title shall be paid an allowance necessary to defray transportation expenses and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance, when the training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of his residence. The Civil Service Commission shall by regulations prescribe the amount of such allowances for various areas of the United States.

"§ 8009. Relocation allowance

"(a) A relocation allowance may be granted to an employee who applies for such an allowance to assist in relocating the employee within the United States when the Civil Service Commission determines that such employee—

"(1) has obtained suitable employment affording a reasonable expectation of long-term duration in the area in which he wishes to relocate, or

"(2) has obtained a bona fide offer of such employment.

"(b) A relocation allowance shall not be granted to such employee unless—

"(1) for the week in which the application for such allowance is filed, he is entitled (determined without regard to section 8004

(c) and (e) of this title) to a readjustment allowance or would be so entitled (determined without regard to whether he filed application therefor) but for the fact that he has obtained the employment described in subsection (a) (1) of this section; and

"(2) such relocation occurs within a reasonable period after the filing of such application or (in the case of an employee who is being provided training under section 8007 of this title) within a reasonable period after the conclusion of such training.

"(c) For purposes of this section, the term 'relocation allowance' means the reasonable and necessary expenses, as specified in regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, incurred in transporting a worker and his family and their household effects.

"§ 8010. Early retirement

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee (1) who has attained 60 years of age and has 10 years of service; (2) who has attained 55 years of age and has 15 years of service; or (3) who has attained 50 years of age and has 20 years of service, is entitled to an annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title.

"§ 8011. Health benefits

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Civil Service Commission shall make whatever arrangements are necessary for the continuation of health benefits, or for obtaining similar health benefits, on such terms and conditions as are deemed necessary for employees after the date of separation if that separation occurred after April 1, 1973.

"(b) In any such arrangement, provisions shall be made to insure that—

"(1) a contribution by an employee who has not obtained new employment shall not exceed 25 per centum of the cost of such benefits; and

"(2) such benefits so far as practicable, will be equivalent to the health benefits to which an employee was entitled to receive prior to his separation.

"(c) No arrangement entered into under this section shall provide for health benefits to an employee for a period of more than 3 years following the date of his separation or for any period after such employee obtains new employment, whichever occurs first."

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

THE NORTH MIAMI BEACH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING CHARGER BAND

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the privilege of meeting with the North Miami Beach Senior High School Marching Charger Band as they were visiting the Washington area.

I was very impressed by their interest in Government affairs and in the Capitol itself.

On May 5, the Charger Band participated in the Apple Blossom Band festival in Winchester, Va., where they won first place in the Class A division and first place in the overall competition.

I would like to congratulate this fine band on their outstanding achievement. They are indeed a credit to their school and to their community.

THE AMERICAN ETHIC

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, an article or story or survey is brought to national attention which reaffirms my faith in the American people and in the future of our Nation.

Such a survey was recently conducted by Louis Harris. I now share the findings of the Harris survey with my colleagues in this body. I sincerely hope that the members of the executive branch of our Government, always sensitive to public opinion, take note.

The article follows:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 26, 1973]

HARRIS: PUBLIC FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

(By Louis Harris)

Some recent probes by the Harris Survey point strongly toward the conclusion that there is indeed a rather deep strain of regard among Americans for the rights and well being of their community neighbors. A number of social critics have been claiming lately that most Americans have become so self-centered that they are interested only in their own material well being and could not care less about their fellow citizens.

Underlying much of the debate on the question of welfare for the poor, for example, has been the contention that Americans feel strongly that individuals ought to be rewarded only on the basis of the extent to which they contribute to society. The idea that the community has a responsibility of its own to provide minimum standards for people to live decently has come under sharp attack late from some quarters.

To test the degree to which people have taken to a hard line approach to social welfare, the Harris Survey recently asked a nationwide cross-section of 1513 households in person:

"If you had to choose, would you rather see a person's income primarily depend on his skills and training or would you rather see people's incomes determined only partly by skills and training and partly by what it costs to live decently?"

How income should be determined

	Percent
Primarily by skills and training-----	38
Partly by what it costs to live decently--	54
Not sure -----	8

A majority of the public gives its support to the proposition that society has an obligation to provide a minimum standard of income to its people, regardless of skill or training.

There are, however, some sharp differences on this question: by 50-42 per cent, business executives favor the work ethic, while union members opt for guaranteed minimum standards by 57-36 per cent. Older persons 50 and over are evenly divided on the issue, but young people under 30 generally agree with the statement that income should be "partly determined by what it costs to live decently."

One of the classic arguments in these times centers around allocation of the country's resources between the private economy and the public sector of health, education, and environmental services. To test this division, the cross-section was asked:

"In your own community, would you rather see your local health, education and anti-pollution services increase or would you rather see more business and industry come into the community?"



Cramer's 9 to 4:30

1-Shot Appeal Plan OKd

By John Cramer
Star-News Staff Writer

President Nixon issued an executive order yesterday authorizing a new, one-shot appeals system for federal employees caught in adverse actions — firings, suspensions, demotions and the like.

The Civil Service Commission, which proposed the new system, hopes it will cut average time for final decision on appeals from the present unpleasant 300 days to 90 or less.

The order will take effect in 90 days.

UNDER IT:

- Agency adverse action appeals systems, which now permit two or even three different appeals levels, will be eliminated.
- The present CSC system, which now ordinarily permits an additional appeal to a hearing examining officer plus a second to the CSC Board of Appeals and Review, likewise will be wiped out.
- The CSC Board of Appeals and Review will be abolished but replaced by a new Appeals Review Board with limited authority.
- Employees will continue to receive 30-day advance notice of proposed adverse action.
- Hearings on their appeals will be conducted by specially-trained hearing officers, whose decisions in most cases will be final.
- The hearings will offer all the due process provided by the present system, but little more. Agencies will continue, for example, to have the right to withhold witnesses requested by employees. There will be no right to subpoena.
- Hearing examiners will report direct to the CSC. Now they report to CSC regional directors, and this too often tends to bend their decisions in management's direction.
- Employees (and agencies) will have the right to appeal some — not too many — hearing examiner decisions to the new Appeals Review Board.
- The three Civil Service commissioners will retain their present right to reconsider review board decisions, which, in their view, involve major policy issues.
- Agencies will retain their authority to finalize adverse action in advance of a final CSC decision on his appeal. Decision before final action was one of the

things federal unions wanted most, but didn't get, in the new system.

All in all, it should be an improvement. Not the best of all systems, and in a couple of ways deficient in due process. But better — let's hope — than what we have now.

* * * *

THE HOUSE EMPLOYEE Benefits subcommittee, headed by Rep. Jerome Waldie, D-Calif., held hearings yesterday on a sure-to-pass bill intended to improve the financial position of the Civil Service Retirement Fund.

It would:

- Revise the present formula under which U.S. agencies re-hire retired federal workers. Now, the retiree draws his retirement annuity plus enough extra from the agency to make up the full salary of his job.
- Result is that agencies save by hiring retirees — at the expense of the Retirement Fund. The new bill would require them to reimburse the fund for the employee's annuity.
- Discontinue the annuities of retired members of Congress appointed by the President for periods of service in jobs which do not require Senate confirmation.

The bill has the support of the administration and federal unions. It would breeze to easy passage.

* * * *

SEN. CHARLES McC. Mathias Jr., R-Md., says he will put a new bill in soon to protect federal workers against downgradings resulting from job reclassifications.

They now are guaranteed against loss of salary for two years.

The pending Mathias bill, similar but not identical to one pending in the House, would provide that an employee whose job is not downgraded during the first three years he holds it will be protected against downgrading as long as he holds it.

"This," Mathias says, "will provide ample opportunity to discover and correct genuinely mistaken job classifications without subjecting federal employees to a lifetime of uncertainty wondering if their jobs are going to be downgraded."

* * * *

NAVY'S "TRADE TALK" asks if you can top the record of Pipefitter Lee J. Rizzo, Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard who recently got a \$115 economy suggestion award for proposing a faster way to assemble certain submarine components at an annual saving to the government of \$1,255.

It was his 80th award, bringing him a total of \$4,621.50 for savings estimated at \$35,726.

STAT

personal
I would like a copy
please